

A CONCEPT FOR THE ALLOCATION OF
SUPERGRADE CEILING, A CLASSIFICATION
OF SUPERGRADE POSITIONS, AND AN
APPEAL MECHANISM FOR CLASSIFICATION DISPUTES

1. There are three internal entities involved in the subject. Those entities are the DCI, the Deputy Directors, and the Director of Personnel, as represented by PMCD.

The DCI

- should approve the allocation of supergrade positions to the line and staff deputies.
- should receive and review an annual report on the distribution and incumbency of supergrade positions, i.e., in consonance with his post-audit theory.
- should not involve himself in the administration of the supergrade system.

Directorates

- should make the initial determination on the distribution of [REDACTED] allocation to those positions which, ILLEGIB

in the opinion of the Deputy Directors, should be awarded the supergrade classification.

- should have the right to earmark a small percentage of their supergrade allocation which can be used for the awarding of personal promotion to outstanding officers so that the expertise of those officers can be used at any given time or place to meet the demands of the service and, further, so that the normal constraints of bureaucracy will not force a reclassification of the position to which assigned.
- should mutually participate with OP/PMCD in the classification of the positions to which supergrade ceiling is awarded, i.e., 16, 17, or 18 level.
- should undertake mutually, with representatives of the Directorates,

Office of Personnel/
PMCD

the classification of positions to which supergrade ceiling has been allocated, as stated above.

- should accept and process promotion actions from Directorates where determinations have been made that individuals will be awarded supergrade status, on the merits of the case, regardless of the grade of the position occupied.


2. There has to be devised two additional procedures to the assignment of responsibilities listed above. The first is the procedure which will bring to the Director's attention a recommendation for a reallocation of supergrade ceiling should any fact make it necessary. A proposal is as follows. The Director will task the Secretary of the Management Committee to present a recommendation responsive to his request. The request could be, for example, an over-all reduction of the [REDACTED] ceiling in the Agency or, from actual

25X1A

point of view, to meet new needs in any given Directorate, to award that Directorate an increase of X number but within the constraints of the total Agency authorization. The Secretary, Management Committee, in turn, will task to prepare the recommendation that one point within the Agency possessing total programmatic knowledge of all Directorates, i.e., the Comptroller. The Comptroller will develop his recommendations in concert with the Directorates, which does not mean he must obtain the concurrence of the Directorates. The Comptroller will present his recommendations to the Management Committee, and the normal process will then follow through. In case of unanimity, there is no problem; but with the lack of unanimity, the positions taken will be reflected to the Director by the Secretary, and the Director will make the ultimate decision.

3. The second procedure is as follows. It is reasonable to assume that there will not always be agreement among representatives of the Directorates and OP/PMCD on the proper classification of any given position. At that point, as with all things, there must eventually be a command decision. I propose such

decision be made as follows. Comptroller, serving as the Chairman, convenes an ad hoc meeting of the four line Associate Deputy Directors, to include representation from NIO or ICS if the case be theirs. The Directorates will make their presentations, OP/PMCD will make theirs, and the majority vote of the sitting ADD's will represent the decision. This will remove from the process the historic and wasteful irritant of such disagreements being the subject of innumerable conversations between opposing staff officers with resultant deferral and further conversations between the Director of Personnel and a Deputy Director and, at times, referral to the DCI for resolution.

4. One other matter should also be taken under consideration. The policy enunciated in paragraph 3c of the Executive Director-Comptroller's memorandum of 14 December 1972, entitled "Supergrade Authorizations and Ceiling," should perhaps be changed. The only regulatory constraint which we are under is not to exceed the number of individuals at the supergrade level  We have been criticized by OMB for having a "gap percentage" between our authorization and our on-duty strength. One reason for this is the lack of flexibility imposed upon us by paragraph 3c of the reference. There are at times individuals in supergrade positions whom, for

a variety of reasons, command points do not wish to promote. This is a direct contribution to the "gap percentage." By having an override of positions, as opposed to having positions equal ceiling, additional flexibility for the award of promotions, and, therefore, the closing of the "gap percentage" becomes immediately available. There is, however, another possible way to meet the "gap percentage." One could still leave the current policy of having positions equate to ceiling; but, by the device of allowing a minimum percentage of supergrade authorization to be used for purposes of personal promotion, as opposed to incumbency in a currently supergrade-classified position, flexibility and latitude are also gained. This could be the answer to the need for flexibility.

5. Reference is again made to the 14 December 1972 memo of the Executive Director-Comptroller wherein a careful reading leads me to conclude that the proposal enunciated above is in keeping with the spirit that the author had in mind. The proposal is also in consonance with the policy of the current DCI to delegate as much authority as possible to the Deputy Directors. The proposal also has further merit in that in those areas of actual or possible controversy where decisions must be made, it brings to bear the collective and current experience, wisdom, and

judgment of senior officers who are attuned to the instant problems of the Director, the world, and the Agency and will allow quick and decisive decisions. Concomitantly, the proposal allows all entities to play their appropriate roles in the system but negates the continuance of a methodology which both fails to capitalize on senior experience and perpetuates bureaucratic haggling.

John F. Blake
Deputy Director
for
Administration

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks:					
<p>POLICE PAPERS</p> <p>Supergrade Ailing</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Approved For Release 2001/09/05 : CIA-RDP81-00264R000100030001-1					
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	